Guide for Review of	S+C Subrecipient Management	
Name of Grantee:	-	
<b>Staff Consulted:</b>		
Name(s) of	Date	
Reviewer(s)		
	·	

**NOTE:** All questions that address requirements contain the citation for the source of the requirement (statute, regulation, NOFA, or grant agreement). If the requirement is not met, HUD must make a finding of noncompliance. All other questions (questions that do not contain the citation for the requirement) do not address requirements, but are included to assist the reviewer in understanding the participant's program more fully and/or to identify issues that, if not properly addressed, could result in deficient performance. Negative conclusions to these questions may result in a "concern" being raised, but not a **"finding."** 

<u>Instructions</u>: The purpose of this Exhibit is to review the S+C grantee's ability to monitor the day-to-day operations of subrecipients for compliance with applicable Federal requirements and achievement of performance goals identified in the approved grant agreement. For the S+C/SRO component, the subcontract is with a Public Housing Authority. For the S+C/SRA component, the contract is with the nonprofit organization.

### **Questions:**

_	
Ι	Describe the grantee's procedures for selecting subrecipients. (Attach copies of written
r	procedures, if available and as applicable.)
I	Describe Basis for Conclusion:

12-1 09/2005

2.			
	Does the grantee have a management system for the oversight of its		
	subrecipients? (If "yes," briefly describe below and, if written, attach a copy of	Yes	No
	relevant portions, as appropriate.)		
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
2			
3.	He the country are and written a great with its submaria and to come out		
	Has the grantee executed written agreements with its subrecipients to carry out activities proposed in the approved grant agreement?	Ш	Ш
	[24 CFR 84.5 for nonprofits; 24 CFR 85.5 for units of local government]	Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:	<u> </u>	
	Describe dasis for Conclusion:		
4.			
••	Does the grantee have a system or method for amending subrecipient		П
	agreements?		□ Na
		Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		

09/2005 12-2

5.			
	Does the grantee review subrecipients for evidence of conflicts of interest either		
	between the grantee and the subrecipients or between the subrecipients and their	Yes	No
	contractors?		
	[24 CFR 582.340(b)]  Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
ó.			
).	Does the grantee have a tracking system or other method of documenting the	$\Box$	
	receipt of Annual Progress Reports (APRs) from its subrecipients?	<u></u>	
		Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
<b>7</b> .			
	Does the grantee have a tracking system or other method of documenting the		
	need for, and actual submission of, subrecipient audits?	Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		
٠.	a. Does the grantee have a method of determining the need for subrecipient on-		
	site or remote monitoring reviews?	<u></u>	
	-	Yes	No
	Describe Basis for Conclusion:		

12-3 09/2005

Describe Basis for Conclusion:  If the grantee uses a risk analysis process for conducting compliance monitoring reviews of its subrecipients, is there evidence that the grantee carries out such reviews in accordance with its own risk analysis process or system?  Describe Basis for Conclusion:  Is there documentation reflecting that the grantee takes appropriate and necessary follow-up actions to address subrecipient monitoring conclusions and findings?	b.	Does the grantee analyze subrecipient performance in assessing compliance monitoring review needs?	Yes	No.
monitoring reviews of its subrecipients, is there evidence that the grantee carries out such reviews in accordance with its own risk analysis process or system?  Describe Basis for Conclusion:  Is there documentation reflecting that the grantee takes appropriate and necessary follow-up actions to address subrecipient monitoring conclusions and findings?  Ves No N/A	Des		Tes	
carries out such reviews in accordance with its own risk analysis process or system?  Describe Basis for Conclusion:  Is there documentation reflecting that the grantee takes appropriate and necessary follow-up actions to address subrecipient monitoring conclusions and findings?  Yes No N/A  Yes No N/A				
Is there documentation reflecting that the grantee takes appropriate and necessary follow-up actions to address subrecipient monitoring conclusions and findings?	car	ries out such reviews in accordance with its own risk analysis process or	. No	N/A
Is there documentation reflecting that the grantee takes appropriate and necessary follow-up actions to address subrecipient monitoring conclusions and findings?				
necessary follow-up actions to address subrecipient monitoring conclusions and findings?		have degree antition reflecting that the greates takes appropriate and		
	nec find	cessary follow-up actions to address subrecipient monitoring conclusions and	Yes	No

09/2005 12-4